

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/347,523	Applicant(s) GOMI, YOSHIYUKI
	Examiner Dung Nguyen	Art Unit 2871

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dung Nguyen

(3) _____

(2) David Cho

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 May 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 4.7 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's presentative has provided an argument to show that the method steps are not inherent to the components of the device; however, even if not inherent, the limitation of "curing a sealing material" would have been obvious to one skilled in the LCD art. Accordingly, the rejection to the method claims stand.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DUNG T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required